

Remarks

Prior to this communication, claims 1 – 4, 7 – 15, and 18 – 21 are pending. Claims 1 – 4, 7 – 15, and 18 – 21 were rejected. By this amendment, claims 1 – 4, 7, 9 – 15, 18, 20, and 21 have been amended; and claims 8 and 19 have been canceled. Examination and reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §102 and §103 Rejections

Claims 1 – 4, 7 – 15, and 18 – 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over IGT Beetle Bailey's Roll for Ranks Slot Game ("IGT"), and further in view of an Official Notice.

Claims 8 and 19 have been canceled. Rejections are deemed moot.

Independent claims 1 and 12 have been amended.

Claim 1 is directed to a gaming system that includes, among other things, a game controller "effecting on the display a bonus feature wherein at least a first outcome is guaranteed to be a successful outcome, awarding a prize of a number of credits, ... , determining a subsequent prize for a successful subsequent outcome, a probability of a successful subsequent outcome based on the subsequent prize of a successful subsequent outcome and the credits accumulated, and a subsequent outcome, if the subsequent outcome is a successful outcome, offering through the display the option of continuing with the bonus feature but, if the subsequent outcome is an unsuccessful outcome, ending the bonus feature, and forfeiting at most a portion of the credits accumulated."

Claim 12 is similarly directed to a "method of playing a game" that includes, among other things, "awarding a number of credits based on the successful first outcome," "accumulating the number of credits to the number of won credits," "if the choice is continuing the bonus feature, determining a subsequent prize for a successful subsequent outcome, a probability of a successful subsequent outcome based on the subsequent prize of a successful subsequent outcome and the credits accumulated, and a subsequent outcome," "if the subsequent outcome is a successful outcome, providing an option of continuing with the bonus feature," and

“but, if the choice results in an unsuccessful outcome, ending the bonus feature and forfeiting at most a portion of the credits accumulated.”

Applicants respectfully submit that IGT does not anticipate claims 1 and 12.

Rather, IGT discloses that “the total die-point count ... counts off the initial climb up the rank status ladder ... [and pressing] Roll to increase the die total and change the offer amount by further climbing the chain of command.” (Page 2, Paragraph 3, IGT.) That is, IGT disclose increasing the die total and changing the offer amount.

Therefore, IGT does not anticipate at least “determining a subsequent prize for a successful subsequent outcome, a probability of a successful subsequent outcome based on the subsequent prize of a successful subsequent outcome and the credits accumulated, and a subsequent outcome, if the subsequent outcome is a successful outcome,” as recited in claim 1, or “if the choice is continuing the bonus feature, determining a subsequent prize for a successful subsequent outcome, a probability of a successful subsequent outcome based on the subsequent prize of a successful subsequent outcome and the credits accumulated, and a subsequent outcome,” “if the subsequent outcome is a successful outcome, providing an option of continuing with the bonus feature,” as recited in claim 12.

Therefore, claims 1 and 12 are allowable. Accordingly, dependent claims 2 – 4, 7, and 9 – 11, and 13 – 15, 18, 20, and 21 are also allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

The Official Notice does not cure the deficiencies of IGT.

As indicated on page 3 of the Action, “the amounts of payout and probabilities that the game is set for is guided by mathematical equations that are not patentable inventions, furthermore the amounts being, approximate or the same or less than, the total prize the player would have gotten, is ruled by the percentage hold the game is set up for and would be considered a design choice amongst the limited choices available.”

Therefore, the Official Notice does not cure the deficiencies of IGT at least with respect to “determining a subsequent prize for a successful subsequent outcome, a probability of a successful subsequent outcome based on the subsequent prize of a successful subsequent outcome and the credits accumulated, and a subsequent outcome, if the subsequent outcome is a successful outcome,” as recited in claim 1, or “if the choice is continuing the bonus feature,

determining a subsequent prize for a successful subsequent outcome, a probability of a successful subsequent outcome based on the subsequent prize of a successful subsequent outcome and the credits accumulated, and a subsequent outcome,” “if the subsequent outcome is a successful outcome, providing an option of continuing with the bonus feature,” as recited in claim 12.

Further, the language that gave rise to the Official Notice is not present in the amended claims 1 and 12.

Therefore, neither IGT nor the Official Notice, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests claims 1 and 12. Claims 1 and 12 are accordingly allowable. Dependent claims 2 – 4, 7, and 9 – 11, and 13 – 15, 18, 20, and 21 are therefore allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

No new matter has been added.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all of claims 1 – 4, 7, 9 – 15, 18, 20, and 21 are allowable. In the event that the Examiner believes a telephone interview with the undersigned Applicant’s Representative would be helpful in advancing prosecution of this patent application, the undersigned is available for telephone consultation during normal business hours.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 23, 2009

/Lawrence M. Jarvis/
Lawrence M. Jarvis
Reg. No. 27,341

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 W. Madison Street
34th Floor
Chicago, IL 60661
Phone (312) 775-8000
Fax (312) 775-8100